



**WORKING GROUP MEETING  
THURSDAY JULY 19, 2001**

**SWANSEA RECREATION CENTER  
2659 EAST 49TH AVENUE  
9:00 AM- 11:30 PM**

**BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVES FOR THE MEETING:**

**Background :**

Feasibility Study . At Working Group meetings and technical meetings over the last several months, EPA presented the results of the baseline risk assessment for lead and arsenic in residential soils at VB/I70 (the residential soils are known as Operable Unit 1 or OU 1). The baseline risk assessment for OU 1 indicates that remedial action is warranted at individual properties within the OU 1 study area (see OSWER Directive 9355.0-30, "Role of the Baseline Risk Assessment in Superfund Remedy Selection Decisions"). EPA has initiated a Feasibility Study (FS) to evaluate alternatives to manage unacceptable health risks.

Similar to the way EPA developed the plans for soil sampling and the pathways which were evaluated in the baseline risk assessment, the first step in the FS is to develop objectives for remedial action.

The objectives, known as Remedial Action Objectives or RAOs, are important because all alternatives will be evaluated on how effectively they will meet the established objectives. The RAOs are developed to be protective of public health.

Draft RAOs were distributed and briefly discussed at the June working group meeting. At this meeting EPA will present and discuss the revised, final RAOs. We plan to have this discussion as the first agenda item.

Direction of Working Group. Is the Working Group meeting the needs of all interested parties? Originally formed as a discussion forum for community representatives, State and local government agencies and other interested parties to provide input to EPA on all aspects of the investigation, risk assessment, and evaluation of risk management options for the VB/I70 Site, community attrition and the approaching remedial decision on the residential soils portion of the site all bring into question the continued usefulness of the Working Group in providing the intended forum.

The Working Group has been meeting monthly since September 1998. During the last several meetings, the following observations have been made:

- Only the Swansea neighborhood has consistently had a representative at the Working Group meetings. Representatives of the other neighborhoods have not recently attended. The time of day of the Working Group meetings and the time commitment may be factors in the decreased level of involvement of these other neighborhoods.
- EPA completed the soil sampling of residential yards and the risk assessment. The next phase of work in the residential areas will be to identify and evaluate cleanup options. A large, open discussion forum on these aspects of the project is appropriate. However, once the project shifts to a focus on the actual cleanup work in the residential areas, EPA will work individually with affected property owners to make decisions on how the work will be done at their property. The large, open forum of the Working Group and the amount of time required for those meetings do not seem to be needed to handle the details of the cleanup at individual properties.
- The Working Group has seemingly made a transition from a large group, meeting monthly for most of a full day, to more frequent, small technical meetings to accomplish the necessary work. As the nature of the information became more technical, EPA observed that the large Working Group did not meet the needs of the State and governmental agencies for providing the necessary technical input to EPA. The smaller technical meetings seem to provide a better forum.
- The work on the smelter areas of the site, operable units 2 and 3, will affect different property owners - the owners of the commercial properties where the old smelter were located. EPA expects a different level of interest from the residential property owners in this work.

Given concerns related to community participation, EPA is considering possibly convening a Community Forum. EPA envisions that the Forum could meet every few months for a few hours in the evening. Rather than detailed technical information, EPA and CDPHE as lead and support agencies would report on their activities in more understandable terms and take time to address community raised concerns. The agenda would be less controlled by a regulatory process, and more focused on community issues. Meeting locations could rotate so they occur in all affected neighborhoods. A small group of community members could provide the foundation, and EPA would make additional efforts to involve wider community participation. Small, more frequent, open technical meetings would still occur during working hours to ensure that interested parties have an opportunity to provide comments to EPA and to monitor the progress of the project. The Working Group would also continue to meet regularly as needed although the participants may change.

We plan to have a discussion about the direction of the Working Group as the second agenda item.

## **PROPOSED AGENDA ITEMS**

**1. Remedial Action Objectives and FS Process (9:00 - 10:00)**

**BREAK**

**(10:00 - 10:15)**

**2. Working Group Structure**

**(10:15-11:30)**

Some discussion questions:

Working Group:

- How has the Working Group been useful? Has the Working Group met your needs for this project?
- What has been lacking in the Working Group? What could be improved? How?
- Given the change in focus of the project, what would you like to see in the future for the Working Group? How would you change the Working Group?
- What expectations do you have for the Working Group?
- How would you describe your participation in the Working Group?

Community Forum:

- Would a Community Forum be useful to you? What would make it useful?
- How would you like to see a Community Forum facilitated?
- How do you think we could encourage broader community participation in the Forum?